

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,999	10/29/2003	Wai M. Lee	63702-226-US	5303
24341 7	590 11/02/2006		EXAMINER	
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP.			MOORE, KARLA A	
2 PALO ALTO 3000 EL CAM			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PALO ALTO,	CA 94306		1763	
			DATE MAILED: 11/02/2006	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/694,999	LEE ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Karla Moore	1763			
D	The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
Period fo	• •		//a\ a= ==/aa\ = a\			
WHI(- Exte after - If NO - Failu Any	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Diperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature to received by the Office later than three months after the mail and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. imely filed not this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status			·			
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08	August 2006.				
2a)□		nis action is non-final.				
3)						
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 37-75 is/are pending in the application	ion.				
,	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>52 and 73</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)[Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>37-51,53-72,74 and 75</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner				
	The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 October 2003</u> is/ar		d to by the Examiner.			
,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		•			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	Examiner. Note the attached Office	e Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).			
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received.				
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received in Applica	tion No. <u>09/874,330</u> .			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri	iority documents have been receiv	ed in this National Stage			
	application from the International Bure					
* (See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies not receiv	ed.			
A44 t-	.4(4)					
Attachmen	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) 🗍 lataa ian 0	/DTO 442)			
2) 🔲 Notic	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D	Date			
3) 🛛 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) D Notice of Informal				
rape	er No(s)/Mail Date <u>1003</u> .	6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/694,999

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of the species restriction in the reply filed on 8 August 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the application contains generic claims. This is not found persuasive because the fact that an application contains generic claims is not recognized as a reason for examination of a plurality of species in a single application.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Examiner further notes that in addition to claim 52, claim 73 also reads on the non-elected species and the claim is therefore not included in the following rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 37-38, 44-45, 51, 53-56, 61-62, 68-72 and 74-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,994,030 to Sugihara et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,868,068 to Yamaguchi et al.
- 5. Sugihara et al. disclose an apparatus for converting a precursor material to form a film/layer adherent to a substrate substantially as claimed and comprising: a transfer device (Figures 1 and 2, 4) to deliver substrates between stations; a coating station (3) wherein the substrate is coated with a sufficient amount of precursor material to coat at least a portion of the substrate, wherein upon exposure to sufficient energy forms a film/layer adherent to the substrate; a pre-convert station (1) having a pre-conversion energy generator adapted to expose at least portions of the precursor material to a pre-conversion energy exposure dose of such intensity and duration such that the exposed pre-converted

Application/Control Number: 10/694,999

Art Unit: 1763

material is not converted to a degree sufficient to impair pattern resolution; and a pattern convert station (2) having a conversion energy generator adapted to expose portions of the pre-converted material to a patterned conversion energy dose to form a pattern adherent to the substrate.

- 6. However, while Sugihara et al. do teach that the apparatus can be used to carry out different methods (column 10, rows 10-14), the disclosure does not specifically suggest converting an organometallic precursor material. Nor does the disclosure mention a load station.
- 7. Yamaguchi et al. teach providing a multichamber (including a load station at Figure 2, 43) apparatus for coating and converting an organometallic precursor for the purpose of forming an interconnected large-scale multilayer IC chip, which facilitates the design, trial manufacture and the analysis of faults in multilayer IC chips in a mass production process and thereby the period of development stage is reduced, the mass-production line becomes operative within a short period of time and the yield of the mass-production line is reduced development stage, the mass-production line becomes operative within a short preparatory time and the yield of the mass production line is improved (column 14, rows 22-32).
- 8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the apparatus of Sugihara et al capable of coating and converting an organometallic material and also to have provided a load station in Sugihara et al. in order to form an interconnected large-scale multilayer IC chip, which facilitates the design, trial manufacture and analysis of faults in multilayer IC chips in a mass production process and thereby the period of development stage is reduced, the mass-production line becomes operative within a short period of time and the yield of the mass-production line is reduced development stage, the mass-production line becomes operative within a short preparatory time and the yield of the mass production line is improved as taught by Yamaguchi et al.
- 9. With respect to the energy sources used as recited in claims 38 and 44-45, the preconversion energy source may comprises a heat source, a light source or a combination thereof and the conversion energy source may comprise a light source, an electron beam source, an ion beam source or a combination thereof. See column 9, row 66 through column 10, rows 9.

Art Unit: 1763

41

10. With respect to claim 54, means for developing the pattern (3) are further provided in Sugihara et al.

- 11. With respect to claim 55, a plurality of pattern convert stations (i.e. first and second pattern convert stations).
- 12. With respect to claim 56 and 61-62, the preconversion energy source may comprises a heat source, a light source or a combination thereof and the conversion energy sources may comprise a light source, an electron beam source, an ion beam source or a combination thereof. See column 9, row 66 through column 10, rows 9.
- 13. With respect to claim 68, the second conversion energy generator is different (i.e. distinct) than the first conversion energy generator.
- 14. With respect to claim 69, the second conversion energy generator is the same as the first conversion energy generator (both electron beam energy generators).
- 15. With respect to claims 70 and 71, the atmospheres of each of the preconvert and convert stations is different (see Figure 2).
- 16. With respect to claim 72, the apparatus comprises a plurality of first and second pattern convert stations after a preconvert station. See Figures 1 and 2.
- 17. With respect to claim 75, each of the limitations is addressed above.
- 18. Further with respect to claims 51, 53 and 74, Sugihara et al. teach that the number and arrangement of preconversion and conversion stations can be chosen as dictated by a desired processing method. the courts have ruled that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). The courts have further ruled that the mere rearrangement of parts which does not modify the operation of a device is prima facie obvious. In re Japikse, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950). In re Kuhle, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975).

Art Unit: 1763

- 19. Claims 39-43, 46-50, 57-60 and 63-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugihara et al. and Yamaguchi et al. as applied to claims 37-38, 44-45, 51, 53-56, 61-62, 68-72 and 74-75 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,178,989 to Heller et al.
- 20. Sugihara et al. and Yamaguchi et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above.
- 21. However, while Sugihara et al. and Yamaguchi et al. do teach that different types of energy sources can be used in the invention, Sugihara et al. and Yamaguchi et al. fail to explicitly teach the preconversion energy generator as a heat source and/or the conversion energy generator as a light source.
- 22. Heller et al. teach providing preconversion energy generators as a heat source and/or conversion energy generators as a light sources (Figure 1, 14 and 16, respectively; also see column 15, row 55 through column 16, row 5) for the purpose of providing an apparatus and method comprising materials and pattern transfer processes which exhibit improved characteristics for performing as a photoresist in microlithography processes (column 3, row 19 through column 4, row 2).
- It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided a preconversion energy generator as a heat source and/or the conversion energy generator as a light source in Sugihara et al. and Yamaguchi et al. in order to provide an apparatus and method comprising materials and pattern transfer processes which exhibit improved characteristics for performing as a photoresist in microlithography processes as taught by Heller et al.
- 24. With respect to the specific wavelengths used, the courts have ruled that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. <u>In re Aller</u>, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Conclusion

25. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. USP's 4712013; 5534312; 5989759; and 6159644 diclose pattern exposure processes and/or apparatus.

Art Unit: 1763

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karla Moore whose telephone number is 571.272.1440. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 am-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571.272.1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-

1000.

KARLA MOORE PRIMARY EXAMINER

> Art Unit 1763 30 October 2006